REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. Applicants request that the non-elected claims be maintained and reinstated if amended to track allowed subject matter of the elected claims. Claims 1-6 and 28-31 are pending, with claims 1, 28 (withdrawn), and 30 (withdrawn) being independent.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 31 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,786,784 (Nikodem). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed a window glass for a vehicle. The surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from the longer bus bar toward the shorter bus bar and the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than the heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance.

Nikodem does not teach or suggest that the surface resistance of a conductive film can vary as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Nikodem's statement that "[r]esistance of the of the product can be changed by varying either the silver thickness or the coating parameters of both and is adjusted to compensate for resistance changes due to electric powering, and/or temperature/pressure affects in lamination." See col. 4, lines 11-17. That statement does not teach or suggest that silver thickness or coating parameters can be varied within a *single* conductive film. Instead, the suggestion is only that the silver thickness or coating parameters can be changed as a whole.

This is evident from the fact that the above statement refers to adjusting certain parameters to compensate for resistance changes due to (1) electric powering and (2) temperature/pressure affects in lamination. A laminated glass is manufactured in one chamber at one temperature/pressure condition. A laminated glass is also usually connected to one powering system. Therefore, the variation that Nikodem proposes is solely to account for changes in the lamination conductions or powering systems, not to vary the surface resistance in a *single* conductive film.

Nikodem does not teach or disclose at least the above-described features. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2-6 and 31 depend from claim 1. Therefore, each of those claims is believed allowable for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Although not formally applied in the Office Action, the Examiner also appears to be relying on the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 3,982,092 (Marriot). Applicants respectfully submit that Marriot does not remedy the deficiencies of Nikodem.

Marriot merely suggests that heat generated in a specific region can be greater than that generated in another region. Marriot does not teach or suggest that a surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar. Nor does it teach or suggest that heat generated by a conductive film is more uniform than heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: December 1, 2003

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM:DTL